



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,108	02/20/2002	Pascale Boel	LUD-5310.7 JEL/NDH (10202)	8069
24972	7590	07/26/2004	EXAMINER	
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP 666 FIFTH AVE NEW YORK, NY 10103-3198			BORIN, MICHAEL L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1631	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/081,108

Applicant(s)

BOEL ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Borin

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1631

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Restriction requirement mailed 06/29/2004 is hereby vacated. Examiner apologizes for inadvertent overlooking of the Preliminary Amendment filed 02/20/2002.

Pursuant to the Preliminary Amendment, claims 1-21 are canceled. Claims 22-25 are added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear, in claim 25, line 4, what sample is being contacted according to the claim.

Art Unit: 1631

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims are drawn to method for screening for possibility of a disorder characterized by expression of a BAGE tumor rejection antigen precursor encoded by SEQ ID No. 1, wherein the method comprises determining of binding between said BAGE tumor rejection antigen precursor and an agent specific for the precursor. The agent, in particular, can be an antibody.

The specification discusses a screening approach using nucleic acid determination assay, as well as some therapeutic applications of BAGE precursor/HLA complexes. See pages 28-31. The specification does not disclose any agent specific to BAGE tumor rejection antigen precursor encoded by SEQ ID No. 1 itself, nor its use for screening for possibility of a disorder characterized by expression of a BAGE tumor

Art Unit: 1631

rejection antigen precursor. The instant claims are reach-through claims drawn to downstream uses of the invention disclosed in the specification.

The inventor must be able to describe the item to be patented with such clarity that the reader is assured that the inventor actually has possession and knowledge of the unique method that makes it worthy of patent protection. The reader can certainly appreciate the goal but establishing goals does not make a patent. As the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit stated in a case involving similar issues, an inadequate patent description that merely identifies a plan to accomplish an intended result "is an attempt to preempt the future before it has arrived." *Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171 (Fed. Cir.1993). To satisfy the written-description requirement, the specification must describe every element of the claimed invention in sufficient detail so that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the inventor possessed the claimed invention at the time of filing. *Vas-Cath*, 935 F.3d at 1563; *see also Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention"). Similarly to *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516 (Fed. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1209 (1985) the specification did "little more than outline] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate."

Art Unit: 1631

Section 112, first paragraph, requires the patentee to "show that an invention is complete by disclosure of substantially detailed, relevant identifying characteristics which provide evidence that applicant was in possession of the invention. Even if the inventors were reasonably certain that overexpression of the BAGE tumor rejection antigen precursor encoded by SEQ ID No. 1 indicates presence of a related disorder, there is no showing in the disclosure that they knew to be a fact that binding between said BAGE tumor rejection antigen precursor and an agent specific for the precursor indicates presence of a related disorder. There is no showing of a single embodiment of the invention as claimed. The reader can certainly appreciate the goal but establishing goals does not make a patent. As was mentioned in the rejection, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit stated in a case involving similar issues, an inadequate patent description that merely identifies a plan to accomplish an intended result "is an attempt to preempt the future before it has arrived." *Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171 (Fed. Cir.1993).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a

Art Unit: 1631

patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321[©] may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 22-25 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2,3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,093,540. An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the referenced claim(s) because the examined claim is either anticipated, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re*

Art Unit: 1631

Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the '540 claims teach method for screening for possibility of a disorder characterized by expression of a tumor rejection antigen precursor coded for by a nucleic acid molecule having the sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1 comprising contacting a sample from a subject with an agent, such as antibody, specific for said sequence or an expression product thereof, and determining interaction between said agent and said sequence or said expression product as a determination of possible presence of said disorder.

5. Further, claims 22-25 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 5,683,886. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the '886 claim teaches method for screening for possibility of a disorder characterized by expression of a tumor rejection antigen precursor coded for by a nucleic acid molecule having the sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1 comprising contacting a sample from a subject with an agent, T cell, specific for tumor rejection antigen of instant SEQ ID No. 3 (which is SEQ ID No. 10 in the

Art Unit: 1631

reference). As said antigen of instant SEQ ID No. 3 is a N-terminus sequence of the claimed SEQ ID No. 2, the T cell specific for tumor rejection antigen of instant SEQ ID No. 3 reads on the instantly claimed agent specific for BAGE antigen precursor as it will be specific for a peptide sequence comprising SEQ ID No. 3 as well.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Borin whose telephone number is (571) 272-0713. Dr. Borin can normally be reached between the hours of 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. EST Monday to Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Michael Woodward, can be reached on (571) 272-0722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-0549.

July 23, 2004

mlb

MICHAEL BORIN, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER

